UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,301	04/20/2004	Michael B. Zemel	31894-202099	2573
26694 VENABLE LLI	7590 04/01/200 P	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3438	-	ARNOLD, ERNST V		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20043-9998		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/827,301	ZEMEL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616		

ERNS	I V. ARNOLD	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	ATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sam application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11 periods:	 an amendment, affidavit appeal fee) in compliance v 	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY	action, or (2) the date set forth i SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension all under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 nd the corresponding amount o I statutory period for reply origin	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	-l' 'll- 07 OFD 44 07 .	and the Charles Miles	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>18 March 2008</u>. A brief in comp date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	ision thereof (37 CFR 41.37	'(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior (a) They raise new issues that would require further considerati			cause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or 	for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspo NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	nding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s).	if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will r how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-18. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficie was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and wa	e <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	status of the claims after en	itry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does N See Continuation Sheet.	IOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SE13. ☐ Other:	3/08) Paper No(s). <u>2/13/08</u>		
/Johann R. Richter/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616	3/27/08		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not overcome the rejections of record. Applicant asserts that the reference of Metz et al. does not disclose teach or suggest a benefit attributable to calcium. The Examiner cannot agree. Metz et al. clearly point out "calcium's known effects on lipid metabolism" (Abstract); "lower body weights in Ca2+ supplemented animals" (page 58, left column) and "dietary calcium is affecting cell lipid metabolism or possibly the cation is influencing thermogenesis and caloric utilization" (page 60, left column near bottom of page). Clearly, these are important dietary benefits attributable to calcium. Applicants arguments are not persuasive. No unexpected results have been shown. Applicant asserts that the reference of Schoeder et al. does not anticipate the composition claims because Schoeder et a. do not disclose a dietary plan and a description. The Examiner cannot agree because besides being merely an intended use of the composition as a dietary food for overweight animals the MPEP 2112.01[R-3] III states: Where the only difference between a prior art product and a claimed product is printed matter that is not functionally related to the product, the content of the printed matter will not distinguish the claimed product from the prior art. In re Ngai, 367 F.3d 1336, 1339, 70 USPQ2d 1862, 1864 (Fed. Cir. 2004). Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.